

MOTION FILED
JAN 7 1980

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States
OCTOBER TERM, 1979

No. 79-4

JASPER F. WILLIAMS, et al., Appellants

vs.

DAVID ZBARAZ, et al., Appellees

No. 79-5

ARTHUR F. QUERN, etc., et al., Appellants

vs.

DAVID ZBARAZ, et al., Appellees

No. 79-491

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellant

vs.

DAVID ZBARAZ, et al., Appellees

On Appeal from the United States District Court for
the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A BRIEF WITH BRIEF
AS AMICUS CURIAE BY THE LEGAL DEFENSE FUND
FOR UNBORN CHILDREN IN SUPPORT OF
THE APPELLANTS

Alan Ernest
P.O. Box 2471
Washington, D.C. 20013
Counsel for Amicus Curiae

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE
ON BEHALF OF THE LEGAL DEFENSE FUND FOR UNBORN
CHILDREN

The Legal Defense Fund For Unborn Children is an organization whose interest is to protect the constitutional rights of unborn children.

The amicus presents legal matter to the Court which is not presented by the parties.

The amicus tenders evidence to show that Roe v Wade, 410 US 113 (1973) is based on false evidence and millions of lives have been unconstitutionally exterminated. Of course, this requires the overruling of that case.

If Roe v Wade were overruled, it would be dispositive of this case.

The amicus also adopts by reference the new evidence presented in the brief in support of the Motion To Appoint Counsel For Children Unborn And Born Alive. That evidence shows many Roe v Wade killings to be murder in the first degree.

WHEREFORE, the Court is moved to grant this motion for leave to file this amicus brief.

Alan Ernest
Counsel for Amicus

INDEX

Brief by amicus curiae	1
Summary of Argument	1
Argument	2
PART I: Roe v Wade is Based on False Evidence	2
PART II: The Court's Procedures are Unconstitutional	7
PART III: The Case Against the Supreme Court	11
PART IV: The Supreme Court has Overthrown the United States Constitution . . .	15
Conclusion	23

AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>	
Baxter v Palmigiano, 47 L Ed 2d 810	14
Dartmouth College v Woodward, 4 Wheat. 518 . . .	17
Marbury v Madison, 1 Cranch 137	13,22
Ogden v Sanders, 12 Wheat. 212	17
State v Moore, 25 Iowa 128	6
The Justice Case, 3 Trials of War Criminals before the Nuernberg Military Tribunals . . .	19

Texts

Archbold, J.F., Archbold's Criminal Procedure, Pleading and Evidence (6th ed 1853)	6
Berger, R., Government by Judiciary: The Trans- formation of the Fourteenth Amendment (1977) . .	20
Denman, T., M.D., An Introduction to the Practice of Midwifery (1802)	4
Hodge, H.L., M.D., The Principles and Practice of Obstetrics (1864)	4
Transactions of the American Medical Assn.	6

AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF

For the 51st time, the Supreme Court is petitioned to overrule its 1973 abortion decision, Roe v Wade, 410 US 113. The grounds are set out below in the SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

1. The Supreme Court is petitioned to overrule Roe v Wade on the grounds that it is based on false evidence and millions of lives have been unconstitutionally exterminated. See PART I, *infra* pages 2-7.

2. It is also alleged that, independent of the evidence in Roe v Wade, the procedures used by the Supreme Court to effect and maintain the Roe v Wade killings so palpably violate due process of law as to leave no question that the exterminations are unconstitutional. See PART II, *infra* pages 8-11.

3. It is further alleged that many of the killings that the U.S. Supreme Court asserted to legalize in Roe v Wade are murder in the first degree. The evidence presented in the MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL FOR CHILDREN UNBORN AND BORN ALIVE, filed in this case, is incorporated herein by reference.

4. It is further alleged that the Roe v Wade killings violate federal and state positive criminal statutes. The U.S. Supreme Court is herein charged with crim-

inal falsehood and criminal extermination, including mass murder in the first degree. See PART III, infra pages 11-14.

5. It is alleged that the judges of the United States have combined to overthrow the Constitution of the United States and to establish a government by Judiciary, founded on fraud and murder. See PART IV, infra pages 15-22.

ARGUMENT

PART I ROE v WADE IS BASED ON FALSE EVIDENCE

It is alleged that Roe v Wade, 410 US 113, is based on false evidence and millions of lives have been unconstitutionally exterminated. The documentation to prove this charge has been repeatedly submitted to the Supreme Court.

This documentation was succinctly outlined in counsel's 16th petition to overrule Roe v Wade (Unborn Child Roe v. John J. Sirica, Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, (78)A-215):

"1. even the Supreme Court admitted in Roe v. Wade that if the unborn were 'a "person" within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment' then the case for abortion for convenience 'of course, collapses, for the fetus' right to life is then guaranteed specifically by the Amendment,' and

"2. the express, universal terms of the Fourteenth Amendment ('nor shall any State deprive any person of life . . . without due process of law') on their face, protect the lives of the unborn, as everyone else, and

"3. the holdings of Chief Justice John Marshall (that can be traced through the Constitution, The Federalist Papers, and The Federal Convention of 1787) show that the Supreme Court had no lawful authority to construe an exception to express, universal terms (such as 'any person') unless the Court could prove the exception to the express, universal terms beyond a reasonable doubt, and show that 'had this particular case been suggested' to the framers the 'language would have been so varied, as to exclude it,' and

"4. the Supreme Court presented false evidence to support its conclusion in Roe v Wade that 'the word "person," as used in the Fourteenth Amendment, does not include the unborn,' and but for the false evidence, there is not even a credible foundation, much less a compelling one, for denying the protection of the express, universal terms 'any person' to the lives of the unborn, and

Summary of False Evidence

In introduction, at the time the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted in 1868, most states had already enacted positive statutes that made abortion a crime unless it were necessary to save the life of the mother. Within a few years, these criminal abortion statutes were virtually universal.

Consequently, any theory of a constitutional right to abortion on demand faced an impossible contradiction: How is it possible that the people who adopted the Fourteenth Amendment had enacted positive criminal statutes to protect unborn life, and at the

same time, without a single word of explanation, intended to imply an exception to the express, universal terms that not "any person" can be deprived of life without due process of law, and to create a constitutional right to abortion on demand?

To resolve that fatal contradiction, the Court asserted the hypothesis that when the criminal abortion laws were first enacted, the laws were not intended to protect unborn life, but rather were only intended to protect the mother. This hypothesis was falsely fabricated and used as follows:

(A.) The Supreme Court first asserted, "When most criminal abortion laws were first enacted, the procedure was a hazardous one for the woman." Roe v Wade, 35 L Ed 2d at 174. This was asserted as fact.

The only authority cited by the Supreme Court to prove this assertion of fact was a 20th century medical history book, Haagensen and Lloyd, A Hundred Years of Medicine 19(1943). But this book merely described the hazards of major surgery in general prior to Lister's discovery of antiseptics. The reference did not even mention the abortion operation.

However, the 19th century obstetric authorities throughout the Western World prove the Court's assertion of fact to be false. These 19th century obstetric authorities, based on their own experience in performing abortions, and from hundreds of cases reported from around the world, declared in their obstetric textbooks that the abortion operation, the operation of artificially evacuating the fetus from the womb, was "perfectly safe" to the mother, 2 T. Denman, M.D., An Introduction to the Practice of Midwifery 96(1802)(English physician); or "experience has proved that the dangers of the operation are reduced to a small matter," A.L.M. Velpeau, M.D., A Complete Treatise on Midwifery 530(4th American ed. 1852)(French physician); or "to the mother there is very little danger." H.L. Hodge, M.D., The Principles and Practice of Obstetrics 293(1864)(American phy-

sician). In short, the obstetric authorities prove the Supreme Court's assertion of fact to be false.

The Supreme Court never revealed the "hazardous" abortion "procedure" to which it was referring. Actually, the 19th century physicians used the ancient method: "the membranes of the ovum are punctured," which permitted "the discharge of the waters," which induced the "action of the uterus" to "come on," which resulted in the expulsion of the fetus from the womb. 2 Denman, *supra*, 99. One 19th century physician traced this operation back almost 2000 years.

(B.) The Supreme Court next asserted, "Abortion mortality was high." Roe v Wade, 35 L Ed 2d at 174. This is asserted as fact.

The Supreme Court asserted "Abortion mortality was high" without any authority to support it. It is a naked assertion. The 19th century obstetric authorities also prove this assertion of fact to be false.

(C.) Upon the two false assertions of fact, the Supreme Court infers that "a State's real concern in enacting a criminal abortion law was to protect the pregnant woman, that is, to restrain her from submitting to a procedure that placed her life in serious jeopardy." Roe v Wade, 35 L Ed 2d at 174.

(D.) From the inference that the criminal abortion laws were not intended to protect the unborn, the Court further inferred that, likewise, the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment did not intend it to protect the lives of the unborn, "that the word 'person,' as used in the Fourteenth Amendment, does not include the unborn." Roe v Wade, 35 L Ed 2d at 180. This conclusion rests entirely on inference.

This pyramid of inference is shown to rest on assertions of fact that are false.

Moreover, as independent corroboration of the purpose of the criminal abortion statutes to protect the unborn, 19th century authorities in criminal law, e.g., 2 Archbold, Archbold's Criminal Procedure, Pleading and Evidence 295(6th ed 1853); medical jurisprudence, e.g., F. Wharton and M. Stille, M.D., A Treatise on Medical Jurisprudence 339, 927(2d ed. 1860); medicine, e.g., 13 Transactions of the American Medical Association 56-58 (1860); as well as state supreme courts, e.g., State v Moore, 25 Iowa 128, 135-136(1868), did expressly affirm that these criminal abortion statutes were intended to protect the lives of the unborn.

Consequently, not only is the Supreme Court's inference about the purpose of the 19th century abortion laws shown to rest on false assertions of fact, but there is no other evidence to come to the rescue and save the Court's conclusion. The 19th century authorities prove the very contrary.

In Summary, the Supreme Court bore the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the express, universal terms of the Fourteenth Amendment, "any person," did not include the unborn. Yet, the Supreme Court did not cite one 19th century authority that expressly affirmed that the unborn were not persons within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment, or that there was a constitutional right to abortion on demand; and the Court's conclusion that the 19th century abortion laws were not intended to protect the unborn is shown to rest on false evidence. To the contrary, the 19th century authorities demonstrate that the people who adopted the Fourteenth Amendment not only intended to protect the lives of the unborn, but had already enacted criminal abortion statutes to do so in fact.

"5. the truthful history corroborates that the express, universal terms 'any person' include the unborn, as they do all categories of persons, and

more certainly than many groups. The Supreme Court included corporations and aliens as a 'person' within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment merely on the strength of the express, universal terms 'any person,' without any independent corroborating evidence whatsoever.(The unborn being the only persons ever excluded from the terms 'any person')

"In short, EXHIBIT A shows that the Supreme Court violated the very letter of the Constitution as well as its spirit, and condemned millions of victims to death whom the Constitution endeavors to preserve. . . . (A)nd there appears to be no defense that will not amount to a claim that the Supreme Court is above the law."

PART II THE COURT'S PROCEDURES ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Completely independent of the Court's evidence, supra PART I, it is also alleged that the procedures used by the Supreme Court to effect and maintain the Roe v Wade killings are in such manifest conflict with due process of law as to leave no doubt that the killings are unconstitutional.

As counsel's 17th petition to overrule Roe v Wade pointed out (Gaetano v. Earl Silbert, United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, No. 78-427, cert. denied 58 L Ed 2d 324):

"The evidence in Roe v Wade aside, the procedures used to effect the Roe v Wade killings alone condemn the killings as illegal. The Nuremberg

court, in outlining the case against the Nazi judicial system, noted that many victims were executed after trials which 'did not approach even a semblance of fair trial':

'In many instances they were denied the right to introduce evidence, to be confronted by witnesses against them. . . . They were . . . denied the right of counsel of their own choice, and occasionally denied the aid of any counsel.' [The Justice Case infra p. 19, at 1046.]

"The U.S. Supreme Court has, in broad form, used these very procedures to effect the Roe v Wade killings. For example, in Roe v Wade, the Court used evidence found by itself, which the parties had not cross examined in a judicial proceeding. The Attorney General of Georgia, a party, requested leave to cross examine the Supreme Court's evidence:

'The Court has taken judicial notice of innumerable facts . . . some which are unknown to the parties but which apparently were extricated from various sources by the Court's diligent research, which facts nevertheless should be subject to refutation and counter evidence since they form the foundation of the Court's opinion.' Petition for Rehearing at 4, Doe v Bolton, 35 L Ed 2d 201(1973).

"But the Supreme Court would not allow its evidence to be cross examined by the party. Pet. Rehearing denied, Doe v Bolton, 35 L Ed 2d 694(1973).

"And year after year, the Supreme Court has denied these applications to present evidence on behalf of the unborn victims to show that the unborn are persons whose lives are protected by the U.S. Constitution. This new evidence shows the Supreme Court's evidence to be false; and the Supreme Court will not allow the evidence to be presented.¹

1. In Planned Parenthood of Central

"And no abortion case before the Court appears to have had counsel to especially represent the unborn and defend their constitutional right to

Missouri v Danforth, 49 L Ed 2d 788(1976)(the first major abortion case after Roe v Wade) eight lawyers, as counsel or amici, submitted an amicus curiae brief, outlining the evidence in PART I, supra, and alleging that "newly discovered evidence indicates that Roe v Wade rests upon factual errors that require the overruling of that case."

Since the purpose of amicus briefs is to present legal matter to the Court, not presented by the parties, so that the Court will not go wrong on vital national affairs, the Court seldom rejects amicus briefs. Stern and Gressman, Supreme Court Practice 728 (5th ed 1978). The landmark constitutional decision which applied the Fourth Amendment exclusionary rule to the States was predicated upon argument by amicus curiae, not the parties. Mapp v Ohio, 367 US 643, 646 n.3(1961). And in the Missouri abortion case it was only the amicus brief that presented the newly discovered evidence showing Roe v Wade to be based on false evidence.

But the Supreme Court would not allow this amicus brief to be filed. Motion to file by D.C. Right to Life Committee, et al., denied 46 L Ed 2d 633(1976). After refusing to allow this "newly discovered evidence," showing Roe v Wade to be based on false evidence, to be presented on behalf of the unborn, the Court proceeded to nullify parts of the Missouri abortion statute, and effectively extended the killings in the name of Roe v Wade.

And the Supreme Court either refused permission to file amicus curiae briefs, or refused to fully and fairly hear amicus curiae briefs, which presented this new evidence, in Colautti v Franklin, 58 L Ed 2d 596; Bellotti v Baird, L Ed 2d ; Anders v. Floyd, 59 L Ed 2d 442; and Ashcroft v Freiman, affd 59 L Ed 2d 630.

2. The Supreme Court has repeatedly refused to allow counsel to represent children unborn or born alive in its judicial proceedings, and to defend their constitutionally protected right to life.

In Doe v Bolton, the Attorney General of Georgia requested the Court to allow "representation of a guardian ad litem for that fetal entity and for its right to develop to birth." Petition for Rehearing at 5. But the Court denied the request.

In Colautti v Franklin, 58 L Ed 596, the Court again extended the killings in the name of Roe v Wade, after refusing to allow counsel to represent the victims and present the evidence, supra PART I, to show that the victims were being unconstitutionally exterminated by false evidence. Motion denied at 57 L Ed 2d 1131.

In Anders v Floyd, 59 L Ed 2d 442, the Court again refused to allow counsel to represent the victims, and present the evidence, supra PART I, to show that the victims were being unconstitutionally exterminated by false evidence. 59 L Ed 2d 442.

In Bellotti v Baird, L Ed 2d , the Court refused to allow counsel to represent the victims and present new evidence (See MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL FOR CHILDREN UNBORN AND BORN ALIVE in this case) to show that the victims were being murdered. 59 L Ed 2d 451.

In Ashcroft v Freiman, 59 L Ed 2d 630, the Court affirmed an appeal after refusing to allow counsel to represent the victims and defend their constitutional right not to be murdered.

And the Supreme Court refused to allow counsel to represent the victims and defend their constitutional right not to be murdered in Baird v Sharp, cert. denied 60 L Ed 2d 1057, and Preterm v King, cert. denied 60 L Ed 2d 1057.

"In summary, without counsel representing the victims, it appears that the Supreme Court itself produced evidence to condemn the victims; denied permission to cross examine its evidence; and denied requests to present evidence on behalf of the victims, even evidence showing the Court's evidence to be false. Exterminations pursuant to these procedures cannot be pretended to be lawful."

Thus, the Court has repeatedly heard and decided abortion cases, and struck down state abortion laws, and effectively extended the killing in the name of Roe v Wade, and refused to appoint counsel to represent the victims and present new evidence, never presented by the parties, to show that the victims are being exterminated in violation of the U.S. Constitution, and positive criminal statutes, including mass murder in the first degree.

It can not be pretended that it is any longer the government of the United States- any government of Constitution and laws- wherein judges presume to decree killing to be a constitutional right and refuse to even listen to the facts.

PART III THE CASE AGAINST THE SUPREME COURT

Counsel's 8th(Gaetano v Louis Oberdorfer, Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, No. 77-1358), and each subsequent petition, specified the criminal statutes believed violated, and charged the Supreme Court with criminal falsehood and criminal extermination:

"THE CASE AGAINST THE SUPREME COURT

"The evidence appears to support the charge that some Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court have violated federal criminal statutes, such as:

"18 USC 242, Deprivation of rights under color of law,- It is a crime for government officials, acting under pretense of law, to willfully deprive persons of their rights secured by the U.S. Constitution. The documentation in EXHIBIT A, at the very least, permits reasonable people to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that the unborn are persons whose lives are protected by the U.S. Constitution. The evidence that Justices specifically authorized killings throughout the United States, by a willfully false construction of the Constitution, would certainly permit a jury to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that Justices, acting under pretense of law, had deprived millions of unborn persons of their right to life protected by the U.S. Constitution.

"22 D.C. Code 201, D.C. abortion statute,- The felony abortion statute only permits abortions in the District of Columbia to preserve the mother's life or health. The evidence that Justices specifically authorized non-therapeutic abortions in violation of the positive criminal statute, by a willfully false construction of the Constitution, would surely permit a jury to find beyond a reasonable doubt that Justices had aided and abetted those killings.

"22 D.C. Code 105 a, Conspiracy,- When Roe v Wade was decided, non-therapeutic abortions were illegal, not just in the District of Columbia, but generally throughout the United States. The evidence that Justices specifically authorized non-therapeutic abortions in violation of the States' positive criminal statutes, by a willfully false construction of the Constitution, would appear to permit a jury to find beyond a reasonable doubt that Justices conspired to effect those killings.

"18 USC 1503, Obstruction of justice,- It is a

crime to endeavor to obstruct or impede the due enforcement of the law of the land, even by conduct that is otherwise legal, if the motive is corrupt or dishonest. The evidence that the Supreme Court has been petitioned year after year to overrule Roe v Wade on the grounds that it is based on false evidence and millions of lives have been illegally exterminated, and year after year the Supreme Court summarily refused to even listen, would appear sufficient to permit a jury to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that Justices had dishonestly endeavored to obstruct or impede the due enforcement of the law of the land.

"18 USC 1001, False statements,- The evidence that some Justices, within their official jurisdiction, made or adopted false statements in Roe v Wade, and repeated petitions indicated the false statements to be willful and knowing, might be sufficient to permit a jury to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that some Justices had made false statements within 18 USC 1001.

"18 USC 371, Conspiracy,- It is not only a crime to conspire to commit any criminal offense, but also to conspire to defraud the United States by misrepresentation or the overreaching of those charged with the carrying out of the governmental intention. The evidence already mentioned would appear sufficient to permit a jury to find beyond a reasonable doubt that Justices had not only conspired to commit the above mentioned crimes, but also to defraud the United States.

"18 USC 1621, Perjury,- An oath of office to uphold the Constitution would probably not, under ordinary circumstances, support a charge of perjury. However, Chief Justice John Marshall held that for "judges" to "swear" to discharge their duties "agreeably to the constitution" and then "close their eyes on the constitution" and "condemn to death those victims whom the constitution endeavours to preserve" is worse than "solemn mockery," it is a "crime." Marbury v Madison, 1 Cranch at 179-180.

And counsel's 25th petition, and each subsequent petition, to overrule Roe v Wade presented the new evidence, adopted herein by reference, which shows many Roe v Wade killings to be murder in the first degree. The Justices who asserted to legalize those killings may now face the death penalty in very many states.

The Supreme Court has never attempted to show the new evidence to be wrong, much less to prove the charges to be false.

And failure to deny a charge can be taken as an admission that the charge is true. "Underlying the rule is the assumption that human nature prompts an innocent man to deny false accusations and consequently a failure to deny a particular accusation tends to prove belief in the truth of the accusation." McCormick On Evidence 353 (1972). "(T)he Court has consistently recognized that ... silence in the face of accusation is a relevant fact..... Silence is often evidence of the most persuasive character." Baxter v Palmigiano, 47 L Ed 2d 810, 822 (1976). And the rule is ancient. As Socrates cross-examined at his trial over 2000 years ago, "you are silent, and have nothing to say. But is this not rather disgraceful, and a very considerable proof of what I was saying?" And again, "I may assume that your silence gives consent." Apology in Plato 41, 45(Jowett transl. Classics Club 1942). See also, 4 Wigmore, Evidence, §§ 1071-1072 (Chadbourn rev. 1972).

PART IV

THE SUPREME COURT HAS OVERTHROWN THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

The evidence shows that the judges of the United States have combined to overthrow the United States Constitution, and to establish a government by Judiciary, founded on fraud and murder.

A.

It can not be contested that America was founded upon the principle that government derives its "just powers from the consent of the governed." This was adopted by the Continental Congress in the Declaration of Independence. While the Declaration may not be law in itself, it provides definitions by which the law is to be understood. Gulf, Colo. and S.Fe Ry v Ellis, 165 US 150, 159-160(1896).

The first sentence of the U.S. Constitution sets out this mother principle of democracies: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." Congress is elected by the people at regular elections, and thus, its laws are derived from the consent of the governed.

The Constitution itself was adopted by the people in convention. The Constitution is thus derived from the consent of the gov-

erned. And Article V of the Constitution provides the means for amending the Constitution, which likewise makes amendments be derived from the consent of the governed.

B.

Under the U.S. Constitution's Article III, the federal judiciary is not elected by the people, and holds office during good behavior, in effect, for life.

The Constitution gives the judges no power to make laws. The lawmaking power, as admitted by the Supreme Court, is the power to make new rules for the future. *Ross v Oregon*, 227 US 150, 161 (1913).

While the judicial power does not admit to lawmaking, it has been decided that it does admit to determining the meaning of statutes, and the U.S. Constitution. *Marbury v Madison*, 1 Cranch 137(1803). But the Supreme Court has no power to make new laws under the guise of construction. *Pillsbury v United Engineering*, 342 US 197, 199.

The rules used by the courts to construe the meaning of the laws are founded in the principle that laws are derived from the consent of the governed. The purpose of construction is to determine the intent of the lawmaker.

Chief Justice John Marshall recognized this "consent of the governed" as the foundation of the rules that the courts must apply in construing the Constitution.

FIRST: The Constitution must be given the meaning "contemplated by its framers."

Ogden v Sanders, 12 Wheat. 212, 332(1827) (dissenting opinion).

SECOND: "(I)n no doubtful case would it pronounce a legislative act to be contrary to constitution." *Dartmouth College v Woodward*, 4 Wheat. 518, 625(1819).

The foundation under these two rules is too compelling to admit any doubt as to the truth of the two rules.

Since the legitimacy of the Constitution is derived from the consent of the governed, any true construction must give the Constitution the meaning intended by the people who framed and adopted it. The central question is: To what have the people consented. Any policy of construction that disregards the consent of the governed can not be lawful. And to what the people have consented is susceptible to proof by evidence which can be independently verified. Thus the security of a written Constitution.

The second rule is a necessary corollary of the first. The right of the people to govern themselves being so paramount, it takes careful and clear evidence to warrant a conclusion that, in the U.S. Constitution, the people intended to withdraw from themselves the power to make their own laws on that subject. If, after review of the words of the Constitution, and the historical evidence concerning the meaning of those words, a reasonable doubt remains as to whether the makers of the Constitution intended to prohibit such a law, then

the law must stand as valid. The opinions of unelected officials holding office for life are not to be substituted for the judgments of the peoples' elected representatives unless the conflict between the law and the Constitution is clear.

The decisions of Chief Justice John Marshall are submitted as a faithful execution of these two principles of construction.

C.

In his Farewell Address, Washington warned that the customary means of overthrowing constitutions was by usurpation:

If in the opinion of the People, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. 35 The Writings of George Washington 229(Fitzpatrick ed. 1949).

D.

The world does not want for examples of democratic constitutions overthrown by the process of usurpation.

Prior to World War II, the German Constitution was thought to be a model of democracy and freedom, "the most liberal and democratic document of its kind the twentieth century had seen," which declared "Political power emanates from the people." W.L. Shirer, The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich

88-89(Fawcett Crest paperback 1969). Hitler came to power "within the terms of the constitution." Id., at 255.

Thereafter, by usurpation, Hitler became the "supreme judge" of Germany. The Justice Case, 3 Trials of War Criminals before the Nuernberg Military Tribunals 1011 (1951). The decrees of this "supreme judge" were obeyed as law. The "supreme judge" presumed to decree murder to be lawful. And this "supreme judge" was unquestioningly obeyed by the Nazi judges.

At Nuremberg, the Nazi judges claimed the defense that they could not be held accountable for their crimes against humanity, including "extermination," because they were bound by the "decrees" of the "supreme judge" of Germany. The Justice Case, supra, 983-85,1010-1014. The Nuremberg court rejected that defense with the observation, "The dagger of the assassin was concealed beneath the robe of the jurist." The Justice Case, supra, at 985.

Never formally repealed, the Constitution was overthrown by usurpation.

E.

The evidence shows that the judiciary of the United States has set upon a course of usurpation astonishingly similar to that traveled by the Nazi judicial system.

The judges of the United States came to power within the terms of the Constitution. The evidence shows that the judges routinely, as a matter of policy, defy the consent

of the governed, and effectively assert their will to be law. See, R. Berger, Government by Judiciary: The Transformation of the Fourteenth Amendment(1977). This book sets out evidence to show that the Supreme Court has generally construed the Fourteenth Amendment in defiance of the intent of its framers. Berger concludes, "Such conduct impels one to conclude that the Justices are become a law unto themselves." Id., at 408.

The evidence shows that the Supreme Court uses false evidence to defy the intent of the framers. Supra, PART I.

The evidence shows that the Supreme Court has presumed to decree murder to be a constitutional right.. See MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL FOR CHILDREN UNBORN AND BORN ALIVE incorporated herein by reference.

The evidence shows that when it comes to constitutional questions, truth has nothing to do with the federal courts: the will of the judge has become the law.

The evidence, supra pages 7-11, shows that the Supreme Court , in broad form, has used the same procedures to effect and maintain the Roe v Wade killings as the Nazi judges used to condemn their victims:

In many instances they were denied the right to introduce evidence, to be confronted by witnesses against them, or to present witnesses in their own behalf. They were... denied the right of counsel of their own choice, and occasionally denied the aid of any counsel. The Justice Case, supra, 1046.

The evidence shows that, through Roe v

Wade, the Supreme Court has effectively asserted a second method for the government to condemn persons to death.

The first, set out in the Constitution, is by conviction by an impartial jury for violation of express laws enacted by the people and applicable to all in the state; with right of representation of counsel; and right to confront the accusing evidence and cross-examine it; and right to present evidence on behalf of the accused; and right to be acquitted unless found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt; and provision to stop execution if new evidence is discovered.

The second, set out in Roe v Wade, is for a Tribunal holding office for life(without assistance of counsel to defend the victims) to rule the victims out of the human race as inferiors, in violation of the very letter and spirit of the Constitution.

The evidence, supra, shows that the Supreme Court decreed murder to be a constitutional right, and there does not appear to be any defense that will not amount to a claim that the Supreme Court is above the law,- as Hitler was to Germany so the Supreme Court is to America.

The evidence shows that the Supreme Court is being unquestioningly obeyed by the federal judiciary. See counsel's 34th & 35th petitions to overrule Roe v Wade, Unborn Child Roe v. United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, No. 79-166; and Unborn Child Roe v.

John J. Sirica, Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, No. 79-188. Those courts have effectively ruled that they were bound by Roe v Wade regardless of any claim that it was wrongly decided. The federal judiciary is willing to enforce, permit, and omit to stop killings that violate the express terms of the U.S. Constitution, and positive criminal statutes, including mass murder in the first degree, without asking even a single question, much less demanding any answers.

The evidence shows that in the courts of the United States, the will of the judge has replaced the consent of the governed as the basis of law. By any definition, this is the overthrow of the United States Constitution.

If it be true, as Chief Justice John Marshall once held in Marbury v Madison, 1 Cranch 137, 163, 176, 178, that "government of laws, and not of men," founded in a "written constitution" deriving its just power from the "supreme" "authority" of "the people" is "the greatest improvement on political institutions," then the overthrow of that government of laws by lawless federal judges may be the most heinous crime in the history of political institutions.

Furthermore, the Declaration of Independence is perverted by the judges to effectively read that "all Men are created equal,- except those created to die for the convenience of others."

CONCLUSION

If it be true, as Jefferson once wrote, that America is an "experiment" to establish that "man may be governed by reason and truth," and that "truth and reason will eternally prevail, however in times and places they may be overborne for a while by violence," then the facts showing the consent of the governed will ultimately prevail.

And Chief Justice John Marshall held, for federal judges to "swear" to discharge their duties "agreeably to the constitution," and then "close their eyes on the constitution" and "condemn to death those victims whom the constitution endeavors to preserve," is worse than "solemn mockery," it is a "crime." Marbury v Madison, supra, 179-180. The criminal law will not permit the "dagger of the assassin" to be "concealed beneath the robe of the jurist."

If the United States were being ruled over by a Tribunal of murderers holding office for life, and being blindly obeyed by all federal judges who violate the express words of the Constitution and positive criminal statutes, including mass murder in the first degree, without question, then surely it would be a fraud without parallel in the legal history of the world, and tantamount to the overthrow of the Constitution of the United States.

Alan Ernest
Counsel